

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 18, 2006. All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-22, and 24-51 are pending in the case.

Claim 1, 12, 21, and 23 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 2, 5-11, 13, 16-19, 21-22, 40-44, and 54 have been amended to better claim the invention.

No new claims have been added.

Case Believed to be in Condition for Allowance

The Applicant believes that the claims that remain in the case are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-3, 9, 22, and 24-54 have already been allowed. Claims 13-15 and 21 were only rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, which has been addressed. Further claims 5-8, 10-11, and 16-19 now depend from allowable base claims. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests issue of a Notice of Allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

At paragraphs 2-4 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5-8, 12, 13-19, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Specifically, the claims were rejected in relation to use of the phrase “may be.”

The Applicant has amended all the claims to eliminate use of “may be,” replacing the phrase with the affirmative recitation “are allowed to.” In the context of the claims, the meaning of the new phrase is believed to be clear. Accordingly, those of the rejected claims that are still pending are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

At paragraphs 1-2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 12, 18-20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Egbert, U.S. Patent No. 6,236,654, (hereinafter Egbert) in view of Khill, U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030147405 (hereinafter Khill).

At paragraphs 3 of the Office Action, claims 6 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Egbert, and Khill in further view of Gonda, U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030067928 (hereinafter Gonda).

At paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Egbert, and Khill in further view of Bare, U.S. Patent No. 6,556,541 (hereinafter Bare).

At paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Egbert, and Khill in further view of Athreya et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020027906 (hereinafter Athreya).

At paragraphs 8-9 of the Office Action, claims 8, 10, 11, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of Egbert, and Khill in further view of Gleeson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,763,023 (hereinafter Athreya).


The Applicant has cancelled claims 1, 12, 21, and 23 without prejudice and changed the dependency of claims 5-8, 10-11, and 16-19 to depend from other base claims. Accordingly, the above 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections are believed to be moot.

In the event that the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in disposition of this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 951-2500.

In summary, all the independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance and therefore all dependent claims that depend there from are believed to be in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully solicits favorable action.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account
No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Blanchette
Reg. No. 51,477
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500